

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Julia Moran	Team: Squad #06	CCRB Case #: 201910059	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 10/24/2019 1:24 PM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 42	18 Mo. SOL 4/24/2021	EO SOL 12/9/2021	
Date/Time CV Reported Wed, 11/13/2019 9:19 AM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 11/19/2019 2:56 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Witness(es)	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Juan Candelario	06688	948739	PSA 7
2. SGT Michael Bletcher	3912	929740	PSA 7
3. POM Juan Pinero	00895	953256	PSA 7

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Daniel Staple	14749	943844	PSA 7

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.SGT Michael Bletcher	Abuse: Sergeant Michael Bletcher stopped § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
B.POM Juan Pinero	Off. Language: Police Officer Juan Pinero made remarks to § 87(2)(b) based upon race.	§ 87(2)(b)
C.POM Juan Candelario	Discourtesy: Police Officer Juan Candelario spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
D.POM Juan Candelario	Abuse: Police Officer Juan Candelario threatened § 87(2)(b) with the use of force.	§ 87(2)(b)
E.POM Juan Candelario	Off. Language: Police Officer Juan Candelario made remarks to § 87(2)(b) based upon race.	§ 87(2)(b)
F.POM Juan Candelario	Off. Language: Police Officer Juan Candelario made remarks to § 87(2)(b) based upon gender.	§ 87(2)(b)
G.POM Juan Pinero	Discourtesy: Police Officer Juan Pinero spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
H.SGT Michael Bletcher	Discourtesy: Sergeant Michael Bletcher spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
I.SGT Michael Bletcher	Abuse: Sergeant Michael Bletcher took (a) photograph (s)/recording(s) of § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
J.POM Juan Pinero	Abuse: Police Officer Juan Pinero interfered with § 87(2)(b) use of a recording device.	§ 87(2)(b)
K.POM Juan Candelario	Abuse: Police Officer Juan Candelario threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
L.SGT Michael Bletcher	Abuse: Sergeant Michael Bletcher failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	§ 87(2)(b)

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
M.POM Juan Candelario	Abuse: Police Officer Juan Candelario failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	
N.POM Juan Pinero	Abuse: Police Officer Juan Pinero failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)		
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)		
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)		

Case Summary

On November 19, 2019, upon reviewing BWC footage, Sergeant Michael Kurz reported this complaint, on behalf of § 87(2)(b) with IAB under IA log number § 87(2)(b)

On October 24, 2019, at approximately 12:50 p.m., Sgt. Michael Bletcher, PO Juan Pinero, PO Daniel Staple, and PO Juan Candelario from PSA 7 recovered firearms from § 87(2)(b) in the Bronx. § 87(2)(b) who was with an unidentified female, saw the officers and questioned their presence in the building. Sgt. Bletcher asked for § 87(2)(b) ID, which the unidentified female retrieved from an apartment on the 6th floor (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). The officers told § 87(2)(b) they needed to verify his information to see if he had any active warrants.

§ 87(2)(b) asked the officers for his ID back multiple times. He was told he could not have it back until the officers verified his information. During the interaction, PO Pinero told § 87(2)(b) “we are going to find out nigger” (**Allegation B: Offensive Language** – § 87(2)(g)). PO Candelario told § 87(2)(b) “I wish the fuck you would” and “you’re a fucking bozo” (**Allegation C: Discourtesy** – § 87(2)(g)). PO Candelario told § 87(2)(b) that he could “fight him one on one” (**Allegation D: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). PO Candelario then said, “get the fuck out of here nigger” (**within Allegation C, E: Offensive Language** – § 87(2)(g)). PO Candelario told § 87(2)(b) “you don’t know who the fuck I am” and “you a bitch” (**within Allegation C, F: Offensive Language** – § 87(2)(g)). PO Candelario then said, “you a pussy,” “salty ass niggers,” and “bitches do that” (**within Allegation E, F**).

PO Pinero told § 87(2)(b) that they will “run your shit nigger. We’re going to run your shit” (**within Allegation B, G: Discourtesy** – § 87(2)(g)). PO Candelario told § 87(2)(b) he was “not that bright” (**within Allegation C**). When § 87(2)(b) asked for his ID back, Sgt. Bletcher said he would give § 87(2)(b) his “fucking ID” when he was ready (**Allegation H: Discourtesy** – § 87(2)(g)). Sgt. Bletcher raised a phone to § 87(2)(b) face. § 87(2)(b) told him not to take any pictures of him (**Allegation I: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)).

§ 87(2)(b) asked all the officers for their badge numbers. However, § 87(2)(b) did not provide a statement and the officers’ BWC did not capture if they provided their information because they were deactivated before the conclusion of the interaction. § 87(2)(b) raised his phone and PO Pinero hit the phone and told § 87(2)(b) not to take pictures of him (**Allegation J: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). PO Candelario told § 87(2)(b) that he would be arrested (**Allegation K: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). § 87(2)(b) and the female then left. § 87(2)(b) was not arrested or issued a summons. No officer provided § 87(2)(b) with a business card (**Allegation L, M, and N: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)).

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

Six BWC videos were obtained for this incident (BR 01-06).

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Michael Bletcher stopped § 87(2)(b).

The civilians in this case were unavailable. The investigation proceeded based on the BWC footage obtained from this incident.

Sgt. Bletcher's BWC confirmed that he stopped § 87(2)(b) and prevented him from leaving (BR 04). At 32 seconds, Sgt. Bletcher asked § 87(2)(b) for his ID. § 87(2)(b) did not comply. Sgt. Bletcher asked § 87(2)(b) for his ID again and put his arm out to stop § 87(2)(b) from leaving. Sgt. Bletcher told § 87(2)(b) that he needed his ID because he looked familiar. At 1:50 minutes, Sgt. Bletcher again told § 87(2)(b) that he looked familiar and he needed to check something. § 87(2)(b) gave his ID to the officers and asked why they were running it. At 3:24 minutes, Sgt. Bletcher told § 87(2)(b) they needed his ID because he looked like someone they were looking for. At 8:49 minutes, § 87(2)(b) asked for his ID back. Sgt. Bletcher responded that they were still investigating so he could not have it back yet. At 11:15 minutes, Sgt. Bletcher gave § 87(2)(b) his ID back and told him to leave.

Sgt. Bletcher testified that he recognized § 87(2)(b) from a wanted poster in the precinct, which included § 87(2)(b) name and photo (BR 07). The poster noted that § 87(2)(b) was involved in a shooting and gun arrests. When § 87(2)(b) got out of the elevator, he walked in the direction of the apartment that Sgt. Bletcher was informed might have ties to the firearm recovered. Sgt. Bletcher made the decision to stop § 87(2)(b) because he matched a wanted poster and walked towards the apartment that was linked to the recovered firearm.

PO Candelario corroborated Sgt. Bletcher's testimony that § 87(2)(b) walked in the direction of § 87(2)(b) which he was informed might be linked to the recovered firearm. PO Candelario was familiar with § 87(2)(b) face, but did not associate him with a wanted poster until after the incident (BR 10).

PO Staple was not informed about an apartment in connection with any firearm and did not recognize § 87(2)(b) (BR 08).

PO Pinero did not remember if the tip included an apartment number and was not familiar with § 87(2)(b) (BR 09).

A wanted poster regarding § 87(2)(b) was requested from both PSA 7, 42nd Detective squad and Central Resources. The request included § 87(2)(b) pedigree information. However, these requests were closed given that a serial number was additionally required. Requests for a serial number were returned as "No Serial Number Exists" for the wanted poster. Though the wanted poster could be obtained via a case number, as it the command that issued the wanted poster was not identified, it was unknown what the case number would be. Therefore, no wanted poster could be located. (BR 24 – 26).

Request for any I-cards were returned with one match for a witness only I-card for § 87(2)(b). However, this I-card was issued on June 23, 2020, eight months after the incident (BR 27).

§ 87(2)(b)

While Sgt. Bletcher testified that he initially approached § 87(2)(b) because he recognized him from a wanted poster and walked towards the apartment linked to the firearms, the investigation could not confirm the existence of said wanted poster. Although PO Candelario testified he was familiar with § 87(2)(b) he did not link § 87(2)(b) to a wanted poster until the conclusion of the incident. Neither PO Staple nor PO Pinero were familiar with § 87(2)(b) nor were they aware of any specific apartment linked to the firearms. Documentation confirmed there were no open I-cards for § 87(2)(b) at the time of the incident. While a Warrant of Arrest was issued for § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) no officer testified about any knowledge of an active arrest warrant for § 87(2)(b) prior to stopping him. As the investigation could not verify the existence of a wanted poster regarding § 87(2)(b) the investigation could not determine if Sgt. Bletcher had reasonable

suspicion or probable cause to stop § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(g)

Allegation (B) Offensive Language: Police Officer Juan Pinero made remarks to § 87(2)(b) based upon race.

Allegation (C) Discourtesy: Police Officer Juan Candelario spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (E) Offensive Language: Police Officer Juan Candelario made remarks to § 87(2)(b) based upon race.

Allegation (F) Offensive Language: Police Officer Juan Candelario made remarks to § 87(2)(b) based upon gender.

Allegation (G) Discourtesy: Police Officer Juan Pinero spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (H) Discourtesy: Sergeant Michael Bletcher spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)

BWC footage captured various profanities and offensive remarks.

In PO Pinero's BWC, at 3:49 minutes, § 87(2)(b) asked the officers for his ID back. PO Pinero responded that they needed to verify his ID before they gave it back. § 87(2)(b) then told PO Pinero "that's me nigga." PO Pinero responded to § 87(2)(b) with, "Alright, we are going to find out nigger." At the 6:07 mark, PO Pinero told § 87(2)(b) that he was only talking with them because they were police officers, but if he were "a regular dude in the streets then he would not be talking like that." PO Pinero went on to tell § 87(2)(b) to relax as § 87(2)(b) repeatedly told the officers to "run his shit." At 6:15 minutes, PO Pinero told § 87(2)(b) "We're going to run your shit nigger."

In PO Candelario's BWC, at the 4:17 minute mark, § 87(2)(b) repeatedly told PO Pinero to "put his hand in his face." PO Pinero repeatedly responded to "do it." PO Candelario then told § 87(2)(b) that he "wished he would." At 4:25 minutes, PO Candelario told § 87(2)(b) "I wish the fuck you would." At 4:52 minutes, § 87(2)(b) asked the officers for some space and stated "this [inaudible] was fucking bozo." PO Candelario responded with, "You're a fucking bozo" and "get the fuck out of here nigger." At 5:16 minutes, § 87(2)(b) told the officers that in any other circumstance, they would not talk to him how they were. PO Candelario told § 87(2)(b) "you don't know who the fuck I am." § 87(2)(b) responded that PO Candelario was a police officer and was "talking crazy." PO Candelario replied to § 87(2)(b) with, "you a bitch." § 87(2)(b) told PO Candelario, "You a bitch, nigga" and that he was "not a bitch, but a grown man." At 5:35 minutes PO Candelario then said, "you a pussy" and "salty ass niggers." § 87(2)(b) then told PO Pinero that he "was buggin" so PO Pinero asked § 87(2)(b) if he was going to spit in the officer's face. PO Candelario then told § 87(2)(b) "bitches do that." At the 8:17 mark, § 87(2)(b) told PO Candelario that they cannot question him without a lawyer. PO Candelario responded to § 87(2)(b) saying, "you are not that bright."

In Sgt. Bletcher's BWC, at 8:34 minutes, § 87(2)(b) asked Sgt. Bletcher for his ID back. Sgt. Bletcher retorted, "I will give you your fucking ID when I'm ready."

PO Pinero testified that he used profanity and offensive language. He repeated anything § 87(2)(b) said back to him and admitted that he made a mistake.

PO Candelario corroborated that he used profanity during the interaction because he got upset and let his emotions get the best of him. PO Candelario repeated what § 87(2)(b) said back to him because he was in the heat of the moment.

Sgt. Bletcher testified that he used profanity because he forgot where he was in the moment and engaged § 87(2)(b) in the same manner § 87(2)(b) conducted himself.

DAO-DCT Case number 2017-17005 states that the tribunal has held that profane remarks, made during stressful situations or while an officer is trying to get a chaotic situation under control, are not misconduct (BR). The NYPD is committed to accomplishing its mission by treating every citizen with compassion, courtesy, professionalism and respect. Officers pledge to value human life, respect the dignity of each individual and render our services with courtesy and civility, Patrol Guide Section 200-02. Officers are prohibited from using discourteous or disrespectful remarks regarding another person's ethnicity, race, religion, gender, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, or disability, Patrol Guide Section 203-09 (BR17).

PO Pinero and PO Candelario admitted to using both profane language, gender and racial slurs when they spoke with § 87(2)(b). Sgt. Bletcher admitted to using profanity when he spoke to § 87(2)(b). At the time the officers made these remarks, § 87(2)(b) had been stopped and had already given Sgt. Bletcher his ID. Although § 87(2)(b) used profanity and offensive language during the interaction, he complied with the officers' requests for his ID and information. The police officers engaged § 87(2)(b) in the same manner and used profanity and offensive language. The officers were not engaged in a chaotic or stressful situation and admitted that they erred in their use of language. Additionally, the use of offensive language is prohibited and never authorized.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Juan Candelario threatened § 87(2)(b) with the use of force.

PO Candelario's BWC footage showed at the 5:01 minute mark, he told § 87(2)(b) "You can fight me one on one."

PO Candelario testified that he threatened § 87(2)(b) with force because he was upset and lost his cool. PO Candelario felt threatened because § 87(2)(b) spoke aggressively and got close to his and Sgt. Bletcher's face. He thought the situation could escalate and turn physical.

Force may be used when it is reasonable to ensure the safety of a member of the service or a third person, or otherwise protect life, or when it is reasonable to place a person in custody or to prevent escape from custody Patrol Guide 221-01 (BR 14).

The escalation to a threat of force arose five minutes into the encounter. At the time of the threat, § 87(2)(b) had already complied with officers' commands and did not take any physical actions to indicate there was an immediate threat to the safety of the officers. There was no attempt to deescalate the situation. § 87(2)(b) complied with officers' commands.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (I) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Michael Bletcher took a photograph of § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

In PO Candelario's body-worn camera footage, at 9:37 minutes, Sgt. Bletcher raised a cellphone and pointed it in § 87(2)(b) direction. § 87(2)(b) used his hand to cover his face and repeatedly told Sgt. Bletcher not to take pictures of him.

Sgt. Bletcher testified that he had his work phone in his hand but did not take a photograph of § 87(2)(b). Sgt. Bletcher was not sure if he had his personal cellphone out during the incident.

PO Candelario, PO Staple, and PO Pinero did not recall if an officer tried to take a photograph of § 87(2)(b).

Police documents confirmed that no photographs of § 87(2)(b) were taken on a work phone belonging to Sgt. Bletcher, PO Pinero, PO Candelario or PO Staple (BR 11).

Sgt. Bletcher's BWC showed he raised a cellphone and pointed it in the direction of § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) then told Sgt. Bletcher not to take any pictures of him. Sgt. Bletcher testified that he was unsure if he had his personal cellphone out during the incident. Police documents confirmed that no pictures of § 87(2)(b) were found on a work phone associated with Sgt. Bletcher, PO Pinero, PO Candelario, or PO Staple.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (J) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Juan Pinero interfered with § 87(2)(b) use of a recording device.

In PO Pinero's BWC footage, at 10:44 minutes, § 87(2)(b) told PO Pinero that he wanted to see his shield. § 87(2)(b) raised his phone up to his face and pointed it in the direction of PO Pinero. PO Pinero then used his right arm to hit § 87(2)(b) phone and told § 87(2)(b) not to take pictures of him.

PO Pinero confirmed that § 87(2)(b) tried to take a picture of him. He told § 87(2)(b) that he could record, but he could not take any pictures of him. PO Pinero put his hand up and moved § 87(2)(b) phone back. He did not physically touch § 87(2)(b) or his phone.

Individuals have a right to lawfully observe and/or record police activity including, but not limited to detentions, searches, arrests or uses of force. This right extends to individuals in public places, such as streets, sidewalks, and parks, as well as private property in which the individual has a legal right to be present, such as buildings, lobbies, workplaces or an individual's own property. This right to observe and/or record police action can be limited for reasons such as the safety of officers or other members of the public, or when a violation of law is committed by the individual(s) who are observing/videotaping Patrol Guide 203-29 (BR 16).

It is undisputed that § 87(2)(b) tried to take a picture of PO Pinero on his cellphone. By moving § 87(2)(b) phone, he interfered with his ability to record. The patrol guide states that the right to record can be limited for safety reasons. However, § 87(2)(b) was not interfering with PO Pinero's ability to perform his duty and was not posing a threat to his safety.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (K) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Juan Candelario threatened to arrest

§ 87(2)(b)

In PO Candelario's body-worn camera footage, at 57 seconds, Sgt. Bletcher asked § 87(2)(b) where he lived. § 87(2)(b) stated he lived at § 87(2)(b). Sgt. Bletcher then asked him why his ID was in an apartment at § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) told Sgt. Bletcher he was staying with a friend. At 10:55 minutes, PO Candelario told § 87(2)(b) that he was going to be arrested and not to take a picture of his face.

PO Candelario testified that he threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) and he could have been arrested for disorderly conduct due to his overall demeanor during the incident.

PO Staple did not observe anything that § 87(2)(b) could have been arrested for during the incident.

Sgt. Bletcher testified that § 87(2)(b) was irate and could have been arrested for causing a disturbance in the hallway.

PO Pinero testified that § 87(2)(b) was loud and hostile and could have been arrested for disorderly conduct.

Sgt. Bletcher, PO Pinero, and PO Candelario testified that the only people in the hallway during the interaction were Sgt. Bletcher, PO Pinero, PO Candelario, PO Staple, § 87(2)(b) and the female.

Although PO Pinero and PO Candelario stated § 87(2)(b) could have been arrested for disorderly conduct, there was no public element during the time of the incident. They were inside of a private building with no one else in the hallway. § 87(2)(g)

While § 87(2)(b) retrieving his ID from inside the apartment indicates he may have been an invited guest, the investigation could not obtain any civilian statements and consequently could not determine if § 87(2)(b) was the resident of § 87(2)(b) or an invited guest. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (L) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Michael Bletcher failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

Allegation (M) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Juan Candelario failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

Allegation (N) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Juan Pinero failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

Sgt. Bletcher did not offer § 87(2)(b) a business card because he offered to write or verbally provide his information (BR 7). He did not have a business card on him at the time of the incident. PO Pinero did not stop § 87(2)(b) and so he did not have to provide him with a business card (BR 9). PO Pinero probably did not have any business cards on him at the time of the incident. To PO Candelario's understanding, he would have had to provide a business card, but he did not provide one and did not have one at the time.

NYC Administrative Code, Section 14-174 states that officers are required to provide members of the public with business cards after law enforcement encounters, including searches of property, in which no summons is issued, or arrest is made (BR 13).

Sgt. Bletcher stopped § 87(2)(b) and prevented him from leaving. The stop rose to a Level 3 encounter and § 87(2)(b) was not issued a summons or arrested. It is undisputed that the officers did not give § 87(2)(b) a business card during or after the incident.

As Sgt. Bletcher, PO Pinero, and PO Candelario stopped § 87(2)(b) and he was not issued a summons or arrested during the interaction, officers were required by the patrol guide to offer their business cards. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party (BR 21).
- Sgt. Bletcher has been a member of service for 19 years and has been a subject in eight CCRB complaints and 16 allegations, of which two were substantiated.:
 - 200306755 involved allegations of premises entered and/or searched and discourteous language and was closed as complainant uncooperative.
 - § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)
 - 201505946 involved allegations of a frisk, stop, and discourteous language and was closed as mediated.
 - 201606761 involved an allegation of a vehicle stop and was closed as mediated.
 - 201608992 involved substantiated allegations of refusal to provide name/shield number, a stop, § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b) against Sgt. Bletcher. The Board recommended Command Discipline A and the NYPD imposed Command Discipline A.

- 201609410 involved an allegation of gun fired and was closed as exonerated.
- 201804771 involved allegations of question and a discourteous language, of which none were substantiated.
- 201902829 involved an allegation of physical force and was closed as exonerated.
- PO Pinero has been a member of service for eight years and has been a subject in one CCRB complaint and one allegation, § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)
 - § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)
 - § 87(2)(g)
- PO Candelario has been a member of service for ten years and has been a subject in six CCRB complaints and 19 allegations, of which five were substantiated.:
 - 201603587 involved allegations of a frisk, search, search of person, stop, strip-search, § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b) against PO Candelario of which the frisk and search were substantiated. The Board recommended Formalized Training and the NYPD imposed Formalized Training.
 - 201604149 involved an allegation of a stop and mediation was attempted.
 - 201606761 involved an allegation of a vehicle stop and was mediated.
 - 201608992 involved substantiated allegations of a search of person, refusal to provide name/shield number, and a frisk against PO Candelario. The Board recommended Command Discipline A and the NYPD imposed Command Discipline A.
 - 201609410 involved an allegation of gun fired and was exonerated.
 - 201910705 involved allegations of force, interference with recording, refusal to provide name, and discourteous language and was closed as complainant uncooperative.
 - § 87(2)(g)

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- Mediation could not be offered as § 87(2)(b) was unavailable.
- As of March 4, 2020, the New York City Office of the Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim being filed in regards to this complaint (BR 22).
- [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Squad No.: 6

Investigator: Julia Moran
Signature

Inv. Julia Moran
Print Title & Name

09/23/2021
Date

Squad Leader: <u>Jessica Peña</u>	<u>IM Jessica Peña</u>	
<u>09/9/21</u>		
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date